

REMARKS

Claims 2, 3, 7, and 8 have been canceled. Claims 4 and 6, and amended claims 1 and 5 are in the present application.

Claims 1 and 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,940,143 (Igarashi et al.).

Amended independent claim 1 recites in part the following:

"receiving means for tuning and demodulating a reception signal of a frequency bandwidth of a channel having an interference signal, **said interference signal being mixed in said frequency bandwidth of said channel** and having a high peak level in said frequency bandwidth;

phase locking means for attaining phase locking to **only** a portion of said frequency bandwidth of said channel which includes said interference signal such that **phase locking is not attained to another portion** of said frequency bandwidth of said channel;" (Emphasis added.)

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is distinguishable from Igarashi as applied by the Examiner for at least the following reasons.

First, it is respectfully submitted that Igarashi as applied by the Examiner does not appear to disclose "a reception signal of a frequency bandwidth of a channel having an interference signal, **said interference signal being mixed in said frequency bandwidth of said channel**" as recited in claim 1. That is, in the circuit of claim 1, the reception signal has a frequency bandwidth and a channel associated therewith which has an interference signal. As such, the interference signal is in

the same channel as that associated with the reception signal. An example thereof is provided in Fig. 2A and lines 16-22 of page 9 of the present application. In explaining the above 102 rejection with regard to claim 1, the Examiner appears to assert that Igarashi discloses such feature of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that the portions of Igarashi relied on by the Examiner for disclosing such feature do not disclose handling an interference signal which is in the same channel as a reception signal. Instead, it appears that Igarashi specifically discloses handling an interference signal located in a channel adjacent to the desired signal. (See, for example, lines 1-30 of column 7, lines 60-64 of column 10, lines 3-7, 25-29, and 47-49 of column 11 of Igarashi.) Additionally, the following portion of Igarashi includes a portion relied on by the Examiner:

"The above-mentioned conventional receiving apparatus properly operates when receiving a television signal for which the received power between channels is approximately uniform. However, when broadcasting different transmission levels such as broadcasting by a standard television signal such as NTSC (National Television System Committee) broadcasting and a digitally transmitted high-definition television signal which are simultaneously frequency-division-multiplexed, such as the ATV (Advanced TV system in U.S.) and Perfect TV in Japan, it is difficult to remove a signal of an adjacent channel through the filter 20 and the filter 50, so that the signal of the adjacent channel is captured in the receiving apparatus together with the desired signal to be received. The desired signal captured together with the signal of the adjacent channel is then selected by the filter 90. This operation results because the frequencies of the signals when passing the filter 20 and the filter 50 are high and, currently, it is difficult to fabricate a filter having a sufficiently narrow pass band width for passing only the desired signal. Consequently, the desired signal to be received and the signal of the adjacent

channel are processed together by each of the circuits before passing the filter 90 which may be SAW filter. Further, a problem occurs in that the NTSC signal of the adjacent channel is higher than the digital desired channel in level and therefore exceeds the dynamic range of each of the circuits in front of the filter 90, thereby possibly causing interference. Additionally, interference caused by the difference of received power between channels, as mentioned above, may also be caused when off-air TV signals are transmitted over a specific terrain or during a specific weather change." (Lines 37-67 of column 3 of Igarashi.)

It is respectfully submitted that the above portion of Igarashi indicates that the interference being addressed is due to signals in a channel adjacent to that of the desired signal, and is not in the same channel as that of the desired signal.

Second, it is respectfully submitted that Igarashi as applied by the Examiner does not appear to disclose "phase locking means for attaining phase locking to only a portion of said frequency bandwidth of said channel which includes said interference signal such that phase locking is not attained to another portion of said frequency bandwidth of said channel" as recited in claim 1. As best understood, the Examiner appears to assert that elements 130 and 220 of Igarashi are the same as the phase locking means of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that PLL 130 and controller 220 of Igarashi are not the same as the phase locking means of claim 1. That is, the phase locking means of claim 1 may attain "phase locking to only a portion of said frequency bandwidth of said channel which includes said interference signal such that phase locking is not attained to another portion of said frequency bandwidth of said channel." On the other hand, the PLL 130 and controller 220 of Igarashi appear to be used for controlling oscillation of a first local oscillator 120 such that "oscillation is performed at a frequency corresponding to a desired channel. . . ." (Emphasis

added.) (See lines 7-9 of column 6 of Igarashi.) As such, the PLL 130 and controller 220 of Igarashi do not appear to be used for phase locking to only a portion of the frequency bandwidth of the channel which includes the interference signal.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is distinguishable from Igarashi as applied by the Examiner.

For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those previously described with regard to independent claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 5 is also distinguishable from Igarashi as applied by the Examiner.

Claims 4 and 6 are dependent from one of independent claims 1 and 5. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 4 and 6 are also distinguishable from Igarashi as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described with regard to claims 1 and 5.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.

Application No.: 09/862,826

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.0-783

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: July 2, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

892646_1.DOC